REMARKS

Claims 1 and 5-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 5 are amended. Claims 6 and 7 are added and claims 2-4 are canceled without disclaimer. Claim 1 is amend to incorporate the feature of claim 2. Support for the amendments and new claims 6 & 7 may be found in at least the original claims, paragraphs [0029], [0030] and [0040]. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in light of the following remarks.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Knable at the interview held April 16, are appreciated. The followings constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By this Amendment, claim 5 is amended so that claim 5 meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WO 03/045675 (WO '675). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

WO '675 fails to disclose "measuring a radial run-out of the toroidal carcass body of a previously built tire along its entire circumference, and obtaining an inverted first order harmonic waveform by inverting a measured waveform of the radial run-out, or by inverting a first order harmonic component extracted from said measured waveform of the radial run-out, wherein the toroidal carcass body does not include a belt member or a tread rubber member," as recited in claim 5.

WO '675 discloses a tire production method and a tire molding machine. WO '675 discloses measuring a radial runout of a green tire (claim 1 and paragraphs [007]-[0008]) (note: as the Office Action uses U.S. Publication No. 2205/0142238 (Tsujimoto) as a translation of WP '675. Thus, paragraphs of Tsujimoto are cited in this Amendment).

However, as the Examiner indicated at the personal interview, WO '675 fails to disclose measuring a radial run-out of the toroidal carcass body, wherein the toroidal carcass body does not include a belt member or a tread rubber member. Thus, WO '675 fails to disclose the above feature, as recited in claim 5. Thus, claim 5 is patentable over WO '675. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Further, the feature recited in claim 5 has an unexpected result which is not recognized by the applied reference. Measuring a radial run-out of the toroidal carcass body where the toroidal carcass body does not include a belt member or a tread rubber member has an advantage in that it minimizes the feed-back delay of the measured result and it is possible to promptly perform the correction and optimize the positional relationship between the carcass band and the bred cores, before these members are applied (paragraph [0030]). This result is not expected from WO '675, because WO '675 fails to disclose measuring the radial run-out of the toroidal carcass body where the toroidal carcass body does not include the belt member or the tread rubber member.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by and/or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,343,671 (Enders); and claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enders in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,273,600 (Yamamori) or U.S. Patent No. 4,596,617 (Ishii). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Enders, Yamamori and Ishii, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious "a forming drum rotation angle control device that controls the forming drum to rotate by an angle equal to said required angle that the carcass band drum rotates by said band drum rotation angle control means, in an opposite direction," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in canceled claim 2.

The Office Action asserts that a combination of Enders and Yamamori/or Ishii discloses this feature. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that column 10, line 60-column 11, line 6 of Enders, column 8, lines 63-68 of Yamamori and column 4, lines 6-11 of Ishii disclose this feature. Enders discloses that a machine may be used as a first stage machine, and the tire band would then be shaped and completed at a second stage machine (column 10, line 60-column 11, line 6). However, the asserted parts of Enders fail to disclose the structure that corresponds to the claimed forming drum rotation angle control device that controls the forming drum to rotate by an angle equal to said required angle that the carcass band drum rotates by said band drum rotation angle control means, in an opposite direction. Other parts of Enders are also silent about this feature. Thus, Enders fails to disclose the above feature, as recited in claim 1.

Yamamori and Ishii fail to make up for the deficiency of Enders. Yamamori discloses that a former 2 rotates in one direction and then rotates in a reverse direction (column 8, lines 63-68). Ishii also disclose that a drum 15 can rotate in both directions (column 4, lines 6-11). Thus, Yamamori and Ishii disclose that the former/and the drum can rotate in both directions. However, Yamamori and Ishii fail to disclose the structure that corresponds to the claimed forming drum rotation angle control device that controls the forming drum to rotate by an angle equal to said required angle that the carcass band drum rotates by said band drum rotation angle control means, in an opposite direction. Other parts of Yamamori and Ishii are also silent about this feature. Thus, Yamamori and Ishii fail to disclose the above feature, as recited in claim 1.

In this regard, the Office Action asserts that the claimed forming drum rotation angle control means recites the capability to rotate in a reverse direction (the Office Action on page 5). However, claim 1 is amended to clarify the structural feature of the forming drum rotation angle control device that controls the forming drum to rotate by an angle equal to said

required angle that the carcass band drum rotates in a opposite direction. Thus, the claimed forming drum rotation angle control device does not recite mere capability to rotate in the reverse direction. Accordingly, the Office Action's above assertion does not apply.

Thus, Enders, Yamamori and Ishii, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious the above feature, as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Enders, Yamamori and Ishii. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Further, Enders, Yamamori and Ishii fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious "an angle calculation device that determines the required angle by a radial force waveform obtained, before building of a desired tire, with respect to a tire of the same size, or by a characteristic waveform having a correlation to said radial force waveform," as recited in new claim 6. Thus, claim 6 is patentable. Further, claim 7 is patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for the additional features it recites.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Yamashita

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Hirotsuna Yamashita
Registration No. L0563

JAO:HQY/jnm

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 19, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461